REMARKS

Amendments to the Claims

In an effort to the move this case forward, Applicants amend claims 1, 7, and 13 in this Submission. In amending the claims of the present application, Applicants do not concede that the claims as originally filed were not in a condition for allowance.

Applicants presently amend claim 1 to include limitations previously found in dependent claims 2 and 6 of Applicants' original application. As such, claims 2 and 6 are currently cancelled in the present application. Applicants also amend claim 1 to include the limitation "wherein the schema defines tables in a database as well as fields in each table, relationships between fields and tables, and dependencies among tables." Support for this limitation is found at page 12, lines 23-26.

Applicants presently amend claim 7 to include limitations previously found in dependent claims 8 and 12 of Applicants' original application. As such, claims 8 and 12 are currently cancelled in the present application. Applicants also amend claim 7 to include the limitation "wherein the schema defines tables in a database as well as fields in each table, relationships between fields and tables, and dependencies among tables." Support for this limitation is found at page 12, lines 23-26.

Applicants presently amend claim 13 to include limitations previously found in dependent claims 14 and 18 of Applicants' original application. As such, claims 14 and 18 are currently cancelled in the present application. Applicants also amend claim 13 to include the limitation "wherein the schema defines tables in a database as well as fields in each table, relationships between fields and tables, and dependencies among tables." Support for this limitation is found at page 12, lines 23-26. Applicants submit that these amendments do not introduce any new matter into the specification and submit that the claims as currently amended are in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Final Office Action rejects claims 1, 7, and 13 in the present application as being anticipated by Weissman, *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,212,524) (hereafter, 'Weissman'). To anticipate Applicants' claims, Weissman must disclose and enable each and every element and limitation recited in the claims of the present application. As presently amended, claim 1 now includes limitations previously found in dependent claims 2 and 6 of Applicants' original application. The Office Action admits at pages 8-9 that Weissman does not disclose the limitations previously found in dependent claim 2 of Applicants' original application. The Office Action further admits at page 11 that Weissman does not disclose the limitations previously found in dependent claim 6 of Applicants' original application. The limitations of former claims 2 and 6 are now recited in newly amended claim 1 – so that Weissman can no longer be said to disclose all the elements of claim 1. Because Weissman does not disclose and enable each and every element and limitation of amended claim 1, Weissman does not anticipate claim 1 of the present application. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 should be withdrawn.

Relations Among Claims

Independent claim 1 claims method aspects for populating a database according to embodiments of the present invention. Independent claims 7 and 13 respectively claim system and computer program product aspects for populating a database according to embodiments of the present invention. Claim 1 is allowable for the reasons set forth above. Claims 7 and 13 are allowable because claim 1 is allowable. The rejections of claims 7 and 13 therefore should be withdrawn, and claims 7 and 13 should be allowed.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, claims 2-6, 8-12, and 14-18 stand rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over a combination of Weissman, Veronese (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0210445) (hereafter, 'Veronese'), and Medicke (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0236786) (hereafter, 'Medicke'). As discussed above, claims 2, 6,

9

8, 12, 14, and 18 are cancelled in this Submission, and the limitations previously found in claims 2, 6, 8, 12, 14, and 18 have been incorporated into claims 1, 7, and 13 by amendment. The question of whether amended claims 1, 7, and 13 in the present application are obvious or not is examined in light of: (1) the scope and content of the prior art; (2) the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art; (3) the level of ordinary skill in the art; and (4) any relevant secondary considerations, including commercial success, long felt but unsolved needs, and failure of others. *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, No. 04-1350, slip op. at 2 (U.S. April 30, 2007). Although Applicants recognize that such an inquiry is an expansive and flexible one, the Office Action must nevertheless demonstrate a prima facie case of obviousness to reject claims 1, 7, and 13 for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). *In re Khan*, 441 F.3d 977, 985-86 (Fed. Cir. 2006).

The Proposed Combination of Weissman, Veronese, and Medicke Does Not Teach or Suggest Each And Every Element Of Claim 1 Of The Present Application

The proposed combination of Weissman, Veronese, and Medicke does not teach or suggest each and every element or limitation of claim 1 of the present application. As such, the proposed combination of Weissman, Veronese, and Medicke cannot be used to establish a prima facie case of obviousness against the claims of the present application. Consider, as an example of an element not taught or suggested by the proposed combination of references, 'providing a database having a schema, wherein the schema defines tables in a database as well as fields in each table, relationships between fields and tables, and dependencies among tables' as claimed in amend claim 1 of the present application. Claim 1 is currently amended to this limitation, which was previously found in Applicants' original specification.

The Office Action at page 6 takes the position that Weissman at column 2, lines 26-38, column 3, lines 1-2, and column 5, lines 26-32, discloses providing a database having a schema. Applicants respectfully note in response, however, that what Weissman at column 2, lines 26-38, in fact discloses is:

10

The data in the datamart is organized according to a schema. In a dimensional datamart, the data is typically organized as a star schema. At the center of a standard star schema is a fact table that contains measure data Radiating outward from the fact table, like the points of a star, are multiple dimension tables. Dimension tables contain attribute data, such as the names of customers and territories. The fact table is connected, or joined, to each of the dimension tables, but the dimension tables are connected only to the fact table. This schema differs from that of many conventional relational databases where many tables are joined. The advantage of such a schema is that it supports a top down business approach to the definition of the schema.

And what Weissman at column 3, lines 1-2, in fact discloses is:

The schema defines the relationships between the tables and columns. The description further defines how data is to be manipulated and used to populate the tables in the datamart.

And what Weissman at column 5, lines 26-32, in fact discloses is:

Focusing on the datamart creation, the system allows a consultant to build a datamart from a schema definition and a definition of the sources of the data. From the schema definition, the system automatically builds the tables needed in the datamart. Also, from the schema definition, and the sources definition, the system can automatically extract the data from those sources. Depending on the semantic meaning of the data, as defined by the schema definition, the system automatically converts the data from the sources into forms that are readily usable in the datamart. Once the datamart has been created, and the data has been loaded, users can then perform queries on the data.

That is, Weissman at the reference points cited above discloses a datamart that is organized according to a schema which defines the relationships between the tables and columns. Weissman's datamart that is organized according to a schema which defines the relationships between the tables and columns does not teach or suggest providing a database having a schema, wherein the schema defines tables in a database as well as fields in each table, relationships between fields and tables, and dependencies among tables as claimed here because Weissman's schema does not define dependencies among tables. A dependency, as described in Applicants' original specification and recited in

11

claim 1 of the present application, comprises a rule for the database, enforced by a database management system, that a first record in a first table must exist in the database before a second record in a second table may be inserted in the database. Weissman, at the reference points cited above and all other points in Weissman, does not teach or suggest any rule for the database that a first record in a fact table must exist in the database before a second record in related dimension table may be inserted in the database is defined by Weissman's schema. That is, Weissman does not teach or suggest a schema that defines dependencies among tables. In fact, the term "dependency" does not appear in Weissman – not even once. The mere existence of a schema in Weissman is not enough to teach or suggest a schema that defines dependencies among tables.

In addition to the fact that Weissman does not teach or suggest the limitations of amended claim 1 in the present application, Veronese also does not teach or suggest the limitations of amended claim 1 in the present application. Veronese generally discloses specifying and implementing complex business applications to be integrated within an e-business environment. Veronese, however, does not teach or suggest providing a database having a schema, wherein the schema defines tables in a database as well as fields in each table, relationships between fields and tables, and dependencies among tables as claimed here. In fact, the term schema does not appear at any point in Veronese – not even once. As such, Veronese cannot possibly teach or suggest this element of Applicants' claims.

In addition to the fact that Veronese does not teach or suggest the limitations of amended claim 1 in the present application, Medicke also does not teach or suggest the limitations of amended claim 1 in the present application. Medicke generally discloses a data warehouse that incorporates data warehouse information into business objects and generates star-schema tables of the data warehouse from the subscribed business objects. Medicke, however, does not teach or suggest providing a database having a schema, wherein the schema defines tables in a database as well as fields in each table, relationships between fields and tables, and dependencies among tables as claimed here because Medicke does not teach or suggest a schema that defines dependencies between

tables. A dependency, as described in Applicants' original specification and recited in claim 1 of the present application, comprises a rule for the database, enforced by a database management system, that a first record in a first table must exist in the database before a second record in a second table may be inserted in the database. Medicke, at the reference points cited above and all other points in Medicke, does not teach or suggest any rule for the database that a first record in a fact table must exist in the database before a second record in related dimension table may be inserted in the database is defined by Medicke's schema. That is, Medicke does not teach or suggest a schema that defines dependencies among tables. Medicke merely discloses generating fact tables and dimension tables from the data warehouse information of a subscribed business object without making any disclosure relating to a schema that defines dependencies among tables.

Because the cited combination of Weissman, Veronese, and Medicke does not teach or suggest each and every element and limitation of Applicants' claim, the combination of Weissman, Veronese, and Medicke cannot be used to establish a prima facie case of obviousness against Applicants' claims within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 should therefore be withdrawn.

<div align="center">

**The Office Action Does Not Examine
Applicants' Claims Pursuant To _Graham_**

</div>

In addition to the fact that the Office Action has not established a prima facie of obviousness there is another reason that the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn: The Office Action does not examine Applicants' claims in light of the factual inquiries set forth in _Graham v. John Deere Co._, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966). The question of whether Applicants' claims are obvious or not is examined in light of: (1) the scope and content of the prior art; (2) the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art; (3) the level of ordinary skill in the art; and (4) any relevant secondary considerations, including commercial success, long felt but unsolved needs, and failure of others. _KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc._, No. 04-1350, slip op. at 2 (U.S. April 30, 2007); _Graham v. John Deere Co._, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966). "To facilitate review, this analysis should be made explicit." _KSR_, slip op. at 14 (citing _In re Kahn_,

441 F. 3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)). That is, the Office Action must make explicit an analysis of the factual inquiries set forth in *Graham*. In present case, however, the Office Action does not even mention the factual inquiries set forth in *Graham*. As such, the rejections of Applicants' claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are improper and should be withdrawn.

Relations Among Claims

Independent claim 1 claims method aspects for populating a database according to embodiments of the present invention. Independent claims 7 and 13 respectively claim system and computer program product aspects for populating a database according to embodiments of the present invention. Claim 1 is allowable for the reasons set forth above. Claims 7 and 13 are allowable because claim 1 is allowable. The rejections of claims 7 and 13 therefore should be withdrawn, and claims 7 and 13 should be allowed.

Claims 3-5, 9-11, and 15-17 depend respectively from independent claims 1, 7, and 13. Each dependent claim includes all of the limitations of the independent claim from which it depends. Because the combination of Weissman, Veronese, and Medicke does not teach or suggest each and every element of the independent claims, the combination of Weissman, Veronese, and Medicke also does not teach or suggest each and every element of the dependent claims of the present application. As such, claims 3-5, 9-11, and 15-17 are also patentable and should be allowed.

Conclusion

Claims 1, 7, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102 as being anticipated by Weissman. As shown above, Weissman does not disclose each and every element of Applicants' claims. Claims 1, 7, and 13 are therefore patentable and should be allowed. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1, 7, and 13.

Claims 3-5, 9-11, and 15-17 stand rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weissman, Veronese, and Medicke. The combination of Weissman, Veronese, and Medicke does not teach or suggest each and every element of

14

Applicants' claims. Claims 3-5, 9-11, and 15-17 are therefore patentable and should be allowed. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 3-5, 9-11, and 15-17.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. 09-0447 for any fees required or overpaid.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 9, 2008   By:

H. Artoush Ohanian
Reg. No. 46,022
Biggers & Ohanian, LLP
P.O. Box 1469
Austin, Texas 78767-1469
Tel. (512) 472-9881
Fax (512) 472-9887
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS